

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

BRADLEY MARSHALL, ) Case No. CV-11-5319 SC  
 )  
Plaintiff, ) ORDER RE: MOTION FOR  
 ) CLARIFICATION  
v. )  
 )  
WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, )  
et al., )  
 )  
Defendants. )  
 )  
 )

On May 23, 2012, the Court granted Defendants' motions for judgment on the pleadings and entered a pre-filing order, requiring, among other things, that Plaintiff file a motion for leave prior to "fil[ing] any future claims in this District against any Defendant in this action . . . ." ECF No. 79 ("Order") at 28. On the same day, the Court entered judgment in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff. ECF No. 81. Plaintiff has since filed a motion for clarification to determine whether he needs to obtain the Court's permission before seeking review of the Court's Order with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. ECF No. 82. He does not. The pre-filing order is expressly limited to "any future claims" he might file. It does not encompass appeals.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 24, 2012

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE